

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Nicolas Goujon, et al.	Group Art Unit: 3663
Serial No.: 10/532,646	Examiner: Scott A. Hughes
Filed: December 5, 2005	Confirmation No.: 5778
For: Integrated Seismic Sensor Cable	Atty. Dkt. No.: 14.0211-PCT-US 2088.001200

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action dated September 29, 2009, for which the shortened statutory period for response expires October 29, 2009. This response is being electronically filed on October 29, 2009, therefore it is timely filed.

Petition for Extension of Time: If an extension of time is required to allow this paper to be timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct the appropriate extension of time fee(s) and any other fee(s) under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 to 1.21 from Williams, Morgan & Amerson, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-0786/2088.001200.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 2 of this paper.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in the case, 20-31 having been withdrawn. In the Office Action dated June 1, 2009, the Office rejected each of claims 1-19 as follows:

- claims 1-5 and 7-17 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0223822 (“Oldervoll”);
- claim 6 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Oldervoll and U.S. Letters Patent 6,519,395 (“Bevan”) in combination; and
- claims 18-19 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Oldervoll and U.S. Letters Patent 4,491,939 (“Carpenter”) in combination.

Applicants traverse each of the rejections.

I. INTERVIEW SUMMARY

As indicated in the “Interview Summary” dated September 29, 2009, Examiner Hughes and the undersigned participated in a telephonic interview on September 21, 2009. The interview addressed all the pending claims under consideration relative to Oldervoll. There were no other participants and there was no exhibit. Examiner Hughes’ summary is reasonably accurate and complete. An amendment discussed in the interview was presented in Applicant’s “Response to office action dated June 1, 2009” that was filed in the Office on September 21, 2009.

It is Applicant’s understanding that the amendment will put the claims in condition for allowance over the art currently cited in the case. However, the Examiner indicated that further searching might be performed and might result in additional art being cited. Accordingly, there was no indication that the claims would actually be allowed.

II. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and requests that they be allowed to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (713) 934-4053 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 29, 2009

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON
10333 Richmond Dr., Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
(713) 934-7000

/Jeffrey A. Pyle/
Jeffrey A. Pyle
Reg. No. 34,904
Attorney for Applicants